



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ı	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/591,508	09/591,508 06/12/2000		Masanori Chikuba	000736	3585
23850	7590	02/03/2004		EXAM	INER
		RATZ, QUINTOS, I	ROSE, ROBERT A		
1725 K STR	-	V	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006				3723	
				DATE MAILED: 02/03/2004	4 18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Application No. 09/591,508

Applicant(s)

Chikuba et al

Office Action Summary

P

Examiner

Robert Rose

Art Unit **3723**



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	n the cover sheet with the correspondence address
	or Reply	
THEN	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
	ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In ridate of this communication.	no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
- If NO p - Failure - Any rep	eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply at to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10-11-02,	<u>10-24-02, 9-13-02, 3-21-03</u> .
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b) ✓ This action	on is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance e closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex pai</i>	xcept for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is to the Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposit	ion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>2-5, 7, 9-12, and 15-17</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>2-5, 7, 9-12, and 15-17</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers	•
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the di	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	
12) 🗌	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13) 🗌	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) □] All b)□ Some* c)□ None of:	
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been received.
:	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been received in Application No
	application from the International Burea	
*Se	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	e certified copies not received.
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
	The translation of the foreign language provisiona	
15)∐	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachm		u □ a
_	tice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
	tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
J ∐ Inf	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	6) Other;

Application/Control Number: 09/591508

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. Receipt is acknowledged of Applicant's Prior Art Statements, filed September 13, 2002, October 24, 2002, and March 21, 2003, respectively.
- 2. This action is responsive to the interview summary of October 11, 2002. The finality of the last Office action dated July 11, 2002 is withdrawn in accordance with the interview summary.
- 3. This action is further responsive to the amendment filed April 16, 2002.
- 4. Claims 1, 6, 8, and 13-14 have been canceled. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, and 15 were amended. Claims 16-17 have been added.
- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazuaki(Japan No. 10-296018) in view of Masao(Japan No. 10-175172). Kazuaki discloses a method of grinding a magnetic member comprising substantially all of the subject matter set forth in applicant's claims above. A magnetic workpiece(w) is ground by a grinding wheel(c) while grinding fluid is supplied to the grinding region of the work. The grinding fluid is drained from the region and passed through a magnetic separator(1) to remove magnetic sludge from the liquid. The remaining liquid passes through a sedimentation tank(6), and optional filters(2,3)

Application/Control Number: 09/591508 Page 3

Art Unit: 3723

S.

before being circulated back to the grinding region. With regard to Applicant's third step, magnetic coagulation of the remaining magnetic particles in the liquid would be an inherent result of allowing the liquid to settle in the sedimentation tank, since particles of the workpiece are polarized and would naturally tend to agglomerate in the absence of agitation. Note separation of the heavier particles in sedimentation tank(106) after passing through the magnetic separator(101), in the embodiment of figure 11 of Kazuaki. While Kazuaki is silent with regard to the composition of the grinding wheel, such superabrasive grinding wheels are known in the art for use in grinding high-hardness materials such as rare earth magnets, as evidenced by Masao et al. To simply incorporate a conventional resin/superabrasive grinding composition in the grinding wheel of Kazuaki, if such is not already disclosed therein, would have been obvious in view of Masao et al. With regard to claim 3, the lower value of magnetic flux density for the magnetic separator is deemed to constitute no more than an obvious matter of design choice to those of ordinary skill in the art. With regard to claim 15, the rare earth magnet produced by the recited method appears no different than one produced by the prior art method, especially if one considers the obviousness of not recycling the waste material at all, and relies only upon fresh grinding fluid for the entire grinding process on a workpiece. The surface quality of the work would then not suffer as a result of recycling high-hardness swarf from previous workpieces.

7. In view of the new grounds of rejection not necessitated by Applicant's response, this action is not made final.

Art Unit: 3723

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert Rose at telephone number (703) 308-1360.

rr

January 23, 2004.

ROBERT A. ROSE PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 323